

University of Groningen

Dealing With Cultural Diversity

Brug, Peary; Verkuyten, Maykel

Published in:
Youth & Society

DOI:
[10.1177/0044118X06297074](https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X06297074)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2007

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Brug, P., & Verkuyten, M. (2007). Dealing With Cultural Diversity: The Endorsement of Societal Models Among Ethnic Minority and Majority Youth in the Netherlands. *Youth & Society*, 39(1), 112.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X06297074>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Youth & Society

<http://yas.sagepub.com>

Dealing With Cultural Diversity: The Endorsement of Societal Models Among Ethnic Minority and Majority Youth in the Netherlands

Peary Brug and Maykel Verkuyten

Youth Society 2007; 39; 112 originally published online Jul 19, 2007;
DOI: 10.1177/0044118X06297074

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/39/1/112>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Youth & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://yas.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/39/1/112>

Dealing With Cultural Diversity

The Endorsement of Societal Models Among Ethnic Minority and Majority Youth in the Netherlands

Peary Brug

St. Mary's College, College of the University of Surrey, United Kingdom

Maykel Verkuyten

Utrecht University, the Netherlands

The present research was conducted among ethnic minority and majority youth in the Netherlands, examining the endorsement of four models for dealing with multiculturalism: mosaic, melting pot, assimilation, and segregation. Results showed that, compared to the majority group, minorities were more in favor of the mosaic model and less in favor of assimilation. Furthermore, endorsement of the models was related to beliefs about equality, national cohesion and group identification. Among both groups, the former measure was positively related to endorsement of the mosaic and melting-pot models, and negatively to the assimilation and segregation models. The importance of national cohesion was positively related to assimilation and negatively to the mosaic model, but more strongly among the majority group. In addition, for the minority group, group identification was positively related to the mosaic model and negatively to assimilation. For the majority group, these associations were, respectively, negatively and positively related.

Keywords: *cultural diversity models; attitudes; majority and minority youth*

Issues of cultural, linguistic, religious, and ethnic differences have taken renewed and increased importance in many countries, institutions and local contexts. Different ways for dealing with diversity have been proposed and various models have been discussed and examined, such as the *melting-pot* model, the *mosaic* model, the *assimilation* model, and the *segregation* model (see Baubock, Heller, & Zolberg, 1996; Fredrickson, 1999, Joppke, 2004).

These questions of diversity are hotly debated in many countries and in academic circles. For example, a multicultural mosaic model has been

recommended as an effective strategy at the social and local level, but it is also a contested and emotionally loaded concept. The multicultural model has not only been criticized in countries such as France with a republican ideology that focuses on individuals as citizens of the state, but also in countries that officially embrace multiculturalism, such as Canada and Australia. For example, it has been argued that multiculturalism endangers social unity and cohesion, and is also contradictory to the notion of equality and the ideal of meritocracy (e.g., Schlesinger, 1992). Hence, in contrast to multicultural notions that promote the value of diversity as a core principle, there are also arguments for assimilation whereby ethnic minority group members abandon their cultural heritage and adopt the mainstream society's way of life. In addition, there are beliefs in favor of segregation because assumed different cultures are assumed to be incompatible and their coexistence to be inherently problematic (see Barker, 1981; Wiewiorka, 1995).

In the past decades, political scientists, moral philosophers and sociologists have paid increasing attention to these and other issues surrounding ideas and models for dealing with cultural diversity and ethnic relations (e.g., Alba & Nee, 1997; Barry, 2001; Brubaker, 2004; Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000). Philosophical, ideological, and pragmatic arguments are being put forward to defend or challenge diversity theories and policies. This lively debate is ongoing and far from settled. Strikingly, however, there is relatively little knowledge and understanding of public opinion on societal models for dealing with cultural diversity. What the general public thinks about cultural diversity and ways for dealing with it has been left relatively unexamined. This is an important question, however, because ultimately, culturally diverse societies consist of people that face the actual task of living with diversity. There is a clear need for a better understanding of people's attitudes toward different societal models. For one thing, this may provide clues on how to influence and redress existing views, and to implement practices and policies that improve group relations. In doing so, it is important to focus on adolescents and to examine both majority and minority groups.

Adolescence is a period of identity development in which individuals explore their social world and begin to make decisions about their commitments and future. Culture, ethnicity, and race are increasingly important areas in adolescents' lives in which important decisions must be made. Various models have been created with respect to racial and ethnic identity development and formation (e.g., Cross, 1991; Phinney, 1989). Although these models are somewhat different, they suggest a common process in which individuals progress from an unexamined view of their ethnicity to

an exploration phase, and ultimately to a positive and secure sense of their ethnicity. In these models, individuals ideally gain a positive sense of being a member of their ethnic group, together with a positive attitude toward other groups and diversity in general. This development would be typical for late adolescence and young adulthood rather than for middle adolescence (e.g., Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997), but may differ for majority and minority group members (Helms, 1990).

The impact of models dealing with cultural diversity may differ for ethnic majority and minority groups. People from the former group, for example, may stress the desirability or necessity of ethnic minorities adapting to the dominant culture (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003). People from the latter groups, on the other hand, may emphasize their need to maintain aspects of their own identity and the necessity for multiculturalism (e.g., Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002).

The present article examines adolescents' attitudes of both majority (ethnically Dutch) and minority group members (Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese) living in the Netherlands. The central question of the research is the extent to which the endorsement of different societal models that deal with cultural diversity differs between majority and minority youth, and how far the endorsement is related to three key arguments in the public debate on diversity. We conducted a study in which the endorsement of the mosaic, melting-pot, assimilation and segregation models was examined in relation to group identification and beliefs about social cohesion and equality.

Societal Models and Group Status

Various ideologies and models to manage cultural diversity within a society have been proposed and developed. For example, Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, and Senécal (1997) have identified four clusters of state ideologies that shape integration policies toward ethnic minorities in different countries. They situate these clusters in a continuum that ranges from *pluralism* at one end and *ethnist* at the opposite end, with civic and assimilation ideologies in between.

Another example is derived from Berry (2001), who identified four strategies for dealing with diversity in the larger society. Conceptually, these strategies are the result of an interaction between two issues. One concerns the degree to which minority groups can maintain their own culture, as opposed to giving it up and accepting the culture of the host country. The second issue deals with the extent to which there should be intergroup contact, as

opposed to groups turning away from each other. Using these two issues, Berry argues that the multicultural strategy or mosaic model values both cultural maintenance and relationships with the larger society. The assimilation strategy emphasizes only social relationships with the majority group. The segregation strategy implies that cultural maintenance is valued but social relationships with the larger society are not. Exclusion represents the strategy in which the larger society rejects cultural diversity and disapproves of social relationships between ethnic groups. Apart from deeply divided societies, such as apartheid South Africa, this latter model does not seem very relevant for Western societies.

In the present study we investigated the endorsement of four ideological models for dealing with ethno-cultural differences in society. In addition to the multicultural (mosaic) model, the assimilation model, and the segregation model, we focused on the melting-pot model. This model emphasizes the intermingling and fusion of varied cultures in the crucible of daily affairs, resulting in the gradual development of new meanings and forms of life that are not representative of any particular group.

Several theories have emphasized the role of group interests in the dynamics of intergroup relations (e.g., Blumer, 1958; Bobo, 1999). For example, because the status hierarchy is differentially beneficial for members of low and high status groups, social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) has proposed the ideological asymmetry hypothesis. This hypothesis implies that hierarchy-attenuating ideologies such as multiculturalism will appeal more to minority or low status groups than to the majority or high status group. Hierarchy-attenuating legitimizing ideologies support the interests of low status groups and challenge the interests of high status groups. For minority groups, a multicultural or mosaic model offers the possibility of maintaining their own culture and obtaining higher social status in society. Majority-group members, on the other hand, may see ethnic minorities and their desire to maintain their own culture as a threat to their group identity and status position (Barker, 1981; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998). They can be expected to endorse hierarchy-enhancing ideologies more strongly, such as assimilationist ideas in which the majority group's culture predominates and minorities are expected to abandon their cultural identity. Hence, we expected that minority group members would support the multicultural model more strongly than majority group members, whereas the assimilation model will be supported more strongly by the latter than the former group. In addition, we explored ethnic group differences in the endorsement of the segregation and the melting-pot models.

Arguments for or Against the Different Societal Models

Political scientists and moral philosophers have put forward various intellectual and practical arguments for defending or challenging particular societal models for dealing with ethnic and cultural diversity (e.g., Barry, 2001; Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000; Taylor, 1992). Vermeulen and Slijper (2003) show that three core arguments underlie the debates on these models: the value of cultural identity and ethnic group identities in general, social equality and equal opportunities, and social cohesion and state unity. We examined these three central arguments in relation to the endorsement of the different societal models.

First, the models are all about groups and group identities. There is considerable empirical evidence suggesting that, in a situation of group relations, those with high identification with their own group are more likely to show a variety of group-level responses relative to the responses of low identifiers (see Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). This is especially the case when group interests are at stake and the value of the group identity is threatened.

The more minority group members identify with their ethnic group, the more likely they are to consider it important to preserve their own culture and to participate as ethnic group members in social and political life. Multiculturalism emphasizes group distinctions and tends to legitimize the cultural maintenance and identity affirmation of ethnic and racial groups. Hence, the endorsement of multiculturalism can be seen as a collective strategy for dealing with a negative group identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and for challenging group-based hierarchy and domination. In contrast, the more majority group members identify with their own group, the more they can be expected to try to protect their group's interests and status position (e.g. by emphasizing assimilation). Using samples from the United States and Israel, Levin, Sidanius, and Frederico (1998) found a positive correlation between group identification and ideologies that challenge the legitimacy of the status hierarchy for minority groups, whereas for majority groups a negative association was found (see also Sinclair, Sidanius, & Levin, 1998). Furthermore, Verkuyten (2005a) found that among Turkish adolescents and students in the Netherlands, group identification was positively related to multicultural attitudes and negatively to assimilation attitudes, whereas among majority group Dutch participants, these associations were reversed.

Hence, for ethnic minority groups, we expected group identification to be positively associated with the endorsement of the multicultural mosaic model and negatively with the endorsement of the assimilation model. In

contrast, for the majority group, group identification was expected to be associated positively to the assimilation model and negatively to the mosaic model. The associations with the other two models will also be explored.

Second, the question of active support of cultural diversity and group identity is not the only key issue in present-day debates on managing cultural diversity. Another core argument underlying these debates is the notion of social equality and equal opportunities (e.g., Barry, 2001; Vermeulen & Slijper, 2003). Multiculturalism, for example, is typically linked to the notion of equality and seen as an important ideology and policy approach for addressing inequality and structural discrimination. For example, in the United Nations (2004) Human Development Report on Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World it is argued that inequality and discrimination are major obstacles for building culturally diverse societies. Also, political philosophers have argued that ethnic group approaches can be necessary for ensuring that all citizens are treated equally (Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000, see also Barry, 2001). In addition, equality and the prevention of discrimination are central arguments in favor of multiculturalism in everyday ways of thinking (Verkuyten, 2004). Furthermore, assimilation ignores racial and ethnic identities and thereby tends to disregard patterns of structural inequality (Bonilla-Silva, 1996). Given this, we expected to find that a stronger emphasis on the importance of equality and equal opportunities in society is positively associated with the endorsement of the mosaic model and negatively with the assimilation model. That is, people who consider equality and equal rights more important are probably more in favor of the mosaic model and less in favor of the assimilation model. These associations can be expected for both the majority group and minority groups.

Third, cultural diversity and multiculturalism are often contested on the basis of concerns for the unity and stability of the country. According to this view, diversity leads to new problems, increases the possibility of conflict and weakens national cohesion and the unity of the state (see Barry, 2001; Kymlicka, 1995). In their critical studies of "neo-racism" in Europe, Balibar (1991) and Taguieff (1993) argue that cultural differences are typically perceived as a threat to the cohesion and unity of the society. Fear for the unity and stability of the country is also a common and central argument used in everyday life to oppose multiculturalism (Verkuyten, 2004). The extent to which cultural diversity is considered a threat to social cohesion may differ, however, between majority and minority groups. The former group can be expected to emphasize state unity more strongly than the latter. In addition, for the majority group in particular, the emphasis on social

cohesion and state unity can be expected to be positively related to the endorsement of the assimilation model and negatively to the mosaic model.

To summarize, the following expectations derived from our discussion were examined: First, we anticipated that, compared to the Dutch, ethnic minority participants would endorse the mosaic model more strongly and the assimilation model less strongly. Second, we expected for the minority groups a positive association between group identification and the endorsement of the mosaic model, whereas a negative association was expected with the endorsement of the assimilation model. Third—and in contrast—for the majority group, group identification was expected to be positively associated with the endorsement of assimilation and negatively to the endorsement of the mosaic model. Fourth, the attitude toward equality and equal opportunity was expected to be positively related to the endorsement of multiculturalism (mosaic) and negatively to assimilation amongst both groups of participants. Fifth, among the majority group in particular, the emphasis on social cohesion and state unity was expected to be negatively related to the endorsement of the mosaic model and positively to assimilation. In addition, it was explored whether there were ethnic group differences in the endorsement of the melting-pot and the segregation model, and whether group identification, equality and state unity were related to the endorsement of these two societal models.

Method

Sample

The study was conducted in 10 secondary schools. Hence, there is no representative sample, but the advantage of the use of schools is that the participants are comparable in terms of the demographic of the school environment. We wanted to compare the views of students that visit the same schools and live in the same areas. The students were asked to participate in a study on the way that people in the Netherlands think about present-day society. The questionnaires were administered in the classroom under supervision. Students completed the questionnaire anonymously. For the purpose of the present study, we focused on the Dutch participants (Dutch father and mother) as members of the ethnic majority status group, and Surinamese, Turkish, and Moroccan participants as members of the ethnic minority group. The latter group contains participants from the three largest ethnic groups living in the Netherlands. In total, 884 students belonged to

the majority group, and 223 belonged to one of the three ethnic minority groups (87 Surinamese, 85 Turks, and 51 Moroccans). In the analyses, this distinction between majority and minority group is used. Of the students, 49.4% were females and 50.6% were males. Participants were between 15 and 19 years of age and their mean age was 16.6. There were no gender and age differences between the ethnic groups. The ethnic minority participants were either born in the Netherlands or came to this country before the age of 6. Hence, they had been in the country for at least 10 years.

Measures

A questionnaire was used to assess the different variables. We wanted to explain the endorsement of the four societal models; therefore, the measures for these models were presented last in the questionnaire. The participants responded to the questions in the order that they are presented below.

The attitude toward equality and equal opportunity was measured with five items using scales ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 7 (*agree strongly*). Three sample items are "In society everyone should have the same opportunities and rights," "Groups and people should be treated equally," and "Those who are in a difficult position are entitled to support and help."

To measure the importance attached to the cohesion and unity of the state, five items (7-point scales) were used (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2006). Three sample items are "A society that is composed of different groups is more prone to have problems," "The unity of the country is weakened by minorities who maintain their cultures and habits," and "A society that is composed of many different cultural groups has more problems with its national unity than a society with only one or two cultural groups."

Group identification was assessed by means of eight items presented immediately after the participants indicated their ethnic group membership on the questionnaire. The items measure the importance attached to one's ethnic background and are similar to items on Phinney's (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. The items (two were negatively phrased) were measured on the same 7-point scales. Three sample items are "I feel a strong attachment to my ethnic group," "I like being a member of my ethnic group," and "I have a strong sense of belonging to my ethnic group."

The participants were presented with short descriptions of the four societal models. They were asked to indicate how far each model represented their own belief about how a diverse Dutch society should be. Endorsement of the models was measured using scales ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 7 (*agree strongly*), with 4 as a neutral midpoint. The four models were

described as follows: "The mosaic model: a society in which different groups live and work together, but each group also maintains its own cultural identity," "The melting-pot model: a society based on cultural fusion in which group differences are no longer visible," "The assimilation model: a society in which minority groups give up their own culture and take on the culture of the majority group," and "The segregation model: a society in which each cultural group stays apart and lives by itself." In previous (non-published) work we have found that the responses on the mosaic and the assimilation models correlated strongly ($r > .65$) with Berry and Kalin's (1995) Multicultural Ideology Scale. Hence, we decided to use single-item descriptions for all four models.

Results

Factor Analyses

Factor analyses were conducted to examine the dimensionality of the scales for the ethnic majority and minority groups separately. In addition, as a coefficient of factorial agreement between groups, Tucker's phi was computed. A value higher than .90 is seen as evidence of factorial similarity, and such similarity is necessary for a meaningful comparison between ethnic groups (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997).

Equality. All five items measuring the importance attached to equal opportunity loaded on one factor in both the majority and minority group samples, accounting for 50.6% and 46.8% of the total variance, respectively. The value of Tucker's phi was .99. Hence, the analysis provided strong evidence for the factorial similarity of the scale across the two samples. For the majority group, Cronbach's alpha was .75, and for the minority group, alpha was .71.

State unity. For the five items measuring the importance attached to state unity, there was, for the majority sample, one factor that accounted for 47.2% of the variance. For the minority group the single factor accounted for 42.2% of the variance. A Tucker's phi value of .93 was obtained. Cronbach's alpha was .72 for the majority group and .69 for the ethnic minority sample.

Group identification. For the majority group sample, the six items loaded on a main factor that accounted for 37.8% of the variance. For the

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the
Different Measures for Study 1

	Dutch (<i>n</i> = 884)	Turks/Moroccans (<i>n</i> = 136)	
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>F</i> Value
Predictor variables			
In-group identification	4.91 (.92)	5.52 (.97)	78.21***
Equal opportunity	5.36 (.84)	5.66 (.79)	23.60***
State unity	4.46 (1.05)	3.28 (1.75)	159.85***
Model endorsement			
Mosaic model	4.60 (1.61)	5.74 (1.21)	95.53***
Melting-pot model	4.01 (1.52)	4.01 (1.60)	0.02
Assimilation model	4.27 (1.67)	2.87 (1.70)	123.89***
Segregation model	2.31 (1.35)	2.26 (1.44)	0.18

*** $p < .001$.

minority group participants, one main factor was also found, and this factor accounted for 44.1% of the variance. Tucker's phi was .98. Cronbach's alpha was .68 for the majority group and .75 for the ethnic minorities.

Mean Scores of the Predictor Variables

For descriptive purposes, Table 1 presents the mean scores for the three independent measures (identification, state unity, and social equality) for the two groups of participants.¹ To assess whether majority group participants' answers differed significantly from those of the ethnic minority groups, the three measures were examined as multiple dependent variables in MANOVA. There was a significant multivariate effect (Pillai's), $F(3, 1,107) = 93.25$, $p < .001$. The univariate results shown in Table 1 indicate that the two groups differ significantly on all three measures. In comparison to the Dutch, the ethnic minorities identify more strongly with their in-group, emphasize the importance of equal opportunities more strongly, and consider ethnic diversity less threatening for state unity.

For the total sample, there was a negative association between state unity and equal opportunity ($r = -.26$, $p < .001$); the other intercorrelations were not significant. However, for the Dutch participants, state unity was positively related to in-group identification ($r = .28$, $p < .001$), whereas for the ethnic minorities this association was negative ($r = -.21$, $p < .01$).

Endorsement of Society Models

To examine differences in the endorsement of the four models between the majority and the minority groups, we conducted a repeated-measures MANOVA with the four models as a repeated-measures factor. Ethnic group was the between-subjects factor.

The analysis yielded a significant main effect for model endorsement, $F(3, 1,109) = 336.45, p < .001$. Participants endorsed the mosaic model most strongly ($M = 4.87, SD = 1.62$), followed by the endorsement of the melting-pot model ($M = 4.01, SD = 1.55$), the assimilation model ($M = 3.91, SD = 1.79$), and finally the segregation model ($M = 2.31, SD = 1.38$). Pairwise tests indicated that all four scores differed significantly. The mean score for the mosaic model is on the *agree* side of the scale and the scores for the melting-pot and assimilation models are around the neutral mid-point. The mean score for the segregation model indicates that, overall, participants disagreed with the model. Hence, the participants were most in favor of a multicultural society that entailed some aspect of integration and (strongly) rejected segregation.

This main effect, however, was qualified by an interaction effect between model endorsement and ethnic group, $F(3, 1,109) = 56.03, p < .001$. The two groups of participants did not differ in the scores for the melting-pot and segregation models. However, as shown in Table 1, the ethnic minorities endorsed the mosaic model more strongly than the Dutch, whereas the Dutch endorsed the assimilation model more strongly than the ethnic minorities.

Associations Between Model Endorsements

Table 2 shows the Pearson product-moment correlations between the endorsements of the four diversity models for the majority and minority group participants separately. Of the 12 correlations, only 3 are above .16. For both groups, stronger endorsement of the mosaic model is associated with weaker endorsement of the assimilation model. Hence, the multicultural mosaic and the assimilation models seem to have contrasting meanings. In addition, for the ethnic minorities, the endorsement of assimilation is positively related to the endorsement of segregation. The mean scores for both these questions are on the *disagree* side of the scales. Hence, ethnic minority participants who are more against assimilation tend also to be against segregation.

Table 2
Pearson Product–Moment Correlation Coefficients
Between the Four Societal Models

	1	2	3	4
1. Mosaic	—	-.12***	-.55***	-.10**
2. Melting pot	-.04	—	.15***	-.06
3. Assimilation	-.35***	.11	—	.09**
4. Segregation	-.16*	.03	.36***	—

Note: Ethnic majority participants above the diagonal and ethnic minority participants below the diagonal.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Predicting Model Endorsement

Hierarchical regression analyses were used to determine which variables predicted the endorsement of the different society models. For the analyses, we constructed a dummy variable for ethnic group, whereby 0 = *Dutch* and 1 = *ethnic minorities*. In the analyses, ethnic group, in-group identification, equal opportunities, and state unity were used as (centered) continuous variables. In the second step, the three interaction terms between ethnic group and the three continuous variables were included in the regression equation.

Table 3 shows the results for the endorsement of the mosaic model. The model in the first step explains 27.0% of the variance in mosaic endorsement. All variables are significant independent predictors of the endorsement of multiculturalism. Apart from the ethnic group difference already discussed, equal opportunity turned out to be positively related to the endorsement of the mosaic model, whereas in-group identification and state unity were negative predictors. The second step in the regression analysis indicated that the former result did not differ for the Dutch and the ethnic minorities. Hence, for both groups, greater emphasis on equal opportunities was related to a stronger endorsement of the mosaic model. The results for the two other measures were qualified by ethnic group, however.

The second step accounted for an additional 5% of the variance in model endorsement. The interactions between ethnic group and identification and unity made a significant contribution to the explanation of the endorsement of the mosaic model. To examine these interaction effects, separate regression analyses were performed for the majority and for the minority group participants. For the majority group, in-group identification was negatively

Table 3
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis With the Endorsement
of the Mosaic Model as Dependent Variable

	Endorsement of the Mosaic Model	
	Step 1	Step 2
Ethnic group (Dutch)	.29***	.29***
In-group identification	-.06*	-.07*
Equal opportunity	.22***	.20***
State unity	-.32***	-.49***
Ethnic group \times Identification		.11***
Ethnic group \times Equality		-.02
Ethnic group \times Unity		.28***
Multiple r	.52	.57
r -squared change	.27***	.05***
F change	103.62***	27.96***

Note: Standardized regression coefficients (beta).

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

associated to the mosaic endorsement ($\beta = -.09$, $p < .01$), whereas for the minority groups this association was positive ($\beta = .23$, $p < .001$). Therefore, as expected, for the Dutch, higher in-group identification was related to lower endorsement of the mosaic model, whereas for the minority groups higher identification was related to stronger endorsement of this model.

As expected, state unity was negatively associated with mosaic endorsement for the Dutch participants ($\beta = -.47$, $p < .001$). The more strongly the majority group participants stressed the importance of social cohesion and state unity, the less they were in favor of the mosaic model. For the minority groups, no significant association between state unity and the mosaic model was found ($\beta = -.11$, $p > .05$).

The results of the regression analysis predicting the endorsement of assimilation are shown in Table 4, and are in contrast to those for the mosaic model. In the first step, equal opportunity has a main negative effect, but this effect disappears in the second step. The main effects of in-group identification and equal opportunity are again qualified by significant interaction effects with the ethnic group. For the majority group participants, the importance attached to state unity and in-group identification are positively associated with a stronger endorsement of assimilation of minority groups ($\beta = .11$, $p < .001$, and $\beta = .57$, $p < .001$). For the ethnic minorities, stronger state unity is also positively associated with assimilation ($\beta = .24$,

Table 4
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis With the Endorsement
of the Assimilation Model as Dependent Variable

	Endorsement of the Assimilation Model	
	Step 1	Step 2
Ethnic group (Dutch)	-.32***	-.32***
In-group identification	.10***	.11***
Equal opportunity	-.08**	-.04
State unity	.44***	.41***
Ethnic group \times Identification		-.11***
Ethnic group \times Equality		-.02
Ethnic group \times Unity		-.29***
Multiple r	.57	.62
r -squared change	.33***	.05***
F change	136.14***	31.56***

Note: Standardized regression coefficients (beta).

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

$p < .001$), but less strongly than among the Dutch. In-group identification, however, is negatively associated with the endorsement of assimilation ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .05$).

For the endorsement of the melting-pot model, only two predictors were found to be significant. More emphasis on state unity was associated with stronger endorsement of the melting-pot idea ($\beta = .11$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, equal opportunity was also positively related to the endorsement of the melting pot ($\beta = .09$, $p < .01$). There were no significant interaction effects.

For the endorsement of segregation, only equal opportunity was significant; it was a negative predictor ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .001$). Thus, the general rejection of segregation was even stronger among participants who emphasized the importance of equality.

Discussion

Recognizing and accommodating diverse ethnicities, religions, languages, and values is "an inescapable feature of the landscape of politics in the 21st century" (United Nations Development Programme, 2004, p. 1). Questions of ethnic and cultural diversity give rise to lively and important

debates in many countries and in many spheres of life. Diversity is considered desirable and necessary, but it is also challenged for being inequitable and a threat to social cohesion and state unity. Furthermore, culture, ethnicity, and race are increasingly important areas in adolescents' lives, in which important decisions about commitments have to be made. Ethnic-identity development involves the exploration of diversity aimed at achieving a positive and secure sense of being a member of one's ethnic group, together with a positive attitude toward other groups (e.g., Cross, 1991; Phinney, 1989).

The present research, conducted in the Netherlands, focused on majority and ethnic minority group youth and their views toward four societal models for dealing with ethnic and cultural diversity: the mosaic model, the melting-pot model, the assimilation model, and the segregation model. The results showed that both groups rejected the segregation model and had a similar neutral attitude toward the melting-pot model. The minority group participants, however, were more in favor of the multicultural mosaic model than the Dutch youth. In contrast, the Dutch were more in favor of the assimilation model than the minorities. These results indicate that, in the Netherlands, the main issue dividing both groups concerns the degree to which ethnic minority groups can maintain their own culture as opposed to having to adopt the culture of the majority group (see also Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002).

Cultural diversity is typically seen as offering more to ethnic minority groups than to majority groups. For the former, it presents the possibility for maintaining their own culture and a greater likelihood of parity in terms of social equality. For the latter, cultural diversity and minority rights are often seen as threats to the dominant position and higher social status (e.g., Levin et al., 1998; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002). This difference in attitude toward diversity can lead to problematic relational outcomes (Bourhis et al., 1997; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). A lack of mutual attitudes and views may hamper the realization of a positively diverse and equal society.

The importance of the majority or minority group position is also indicated by the different relationships between group identification and the endorsement of the societal models. As predicted, an interaction effect was found, indicating that for the minority groups, group identification was positively associated with the endorsement of the multicultural mosaic model and negatively with the endorsement of the assimilation model. In contrast, for the majority group, group identification was negatively related to multiculturalism and positively to assimilation. For the former groups, high group identifiers were more likely to favor the mosaic model. For them, the

possibility of cultural diversity is important in itself and an emphasis on group differences can also represent a collective response to a negative group identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In contrast, the more the Dutch participants identified with their group, the more they seemed to focus on the negative and threatening aspects of cultural group differences, leading to an emphasis on assimilation. These results for group identification are in agreement with other studies that have found that high identifiers, in particular, show a variety of group-level responses, including majority and minority group members' differential views of multiculturalism and assimilation (e.g., Ellemers et al., 1999; Levin et al., 1998; Sinclair et al., 1998; Verkuyten, 2005a).

The results also indicate some of the problems and dilemmas surrounding a diverse society in which group identities are emphasized and affirmed. For ethnic minorities, a strong group identity is consistent with multicultural ideals, but for majority group members there seems to be a contradiction. For them, an emphasis on national identity corresponds more to ideas about assimilation rather than cultural diversity, which is typically seen as threatening Dutch culture and society (e.g., Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998). Future studies, however, should examine this relationship in other countries. In the Netherlands there is a long history of an established majority group, and issues stemming from immigration, migrant minorities, and cultural diversity are relatively novel. In contrast, countries such as Canada, the United States, and Australia are largely composed of immigrants and (in part) cultural diversity is a defining characteristic of these nations (Vermeulen & Slijper, 2003). This could mean, for example, that the negative association between group identification and multiculturalism found among majority group participants might be more positive in these countries.

The importance of the group position is further suggested by the findings that, compared to the majority group participants, the ethnic minorities showed stronger group identification and had a more positive attitude toward equality and equal opportunities, and emphasized the importance of social cohesion and state unity less. The first result is a common finding in Dutch research and among ethnic groups more generally (see Verkuyten, 2005b). This is consistent with social-identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) which predicts that, especially in situations where group boundaries are perceived as impermeable and relatively secure, minority group members will stress their ethnic identity to counteract a negative social identity (see also Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). Hence, the fact that ethnic minority groups have a low social status in the Netherlands, which is

recognized by both Dutch and minority group youth (Hagendoorn, 1995), may be the reason for their stronger identification with their own ethnic group.

Compared to the Dutch, the ethnic minority participants valued equality more and emphasized social cohesion and state unity less; however, the association with the endorsement of the multicultural mosaic and assimilation models were similar. For both groups, a more positive attitude toward equality was positively related to multiculturalism and negatively to assimilation. Hence, participants who valued equality and equal opportunity were more in favor of minority groups maintaining their own cultural identity. In addition, equal opportunity had an effect on the endorsement of the melting-pot model and the segregation model. Furthermore, a stronger emphasis on social cohesion and state unity was associated with lower endorsement of multiculturalism and higher endorsement of assimilation. However, these associations were significantly stronger for the Dutch than for the ethnic minority participants. Social cohesion also had a main positive effect on the endorsement of the melting-pot model. These results suggest that the recognition of inequalities and the importance of social cohesion represent more general arguments for accepting and endorsing diversity and cultural differences (see also Verkuyten, 2004). Both arguments are central to debates on multiculturalism and they seem to affect adolescents' views in similar ways, although social cohesion is a more important consideration for majority group youth.

The present findings indicate that, to understand adolescents' endorsement of different societal models for dealing with ethnic and cultural diversity, it is important to pay attention to different groups and beliefs. We have examined the endorsement of four models among majority and minority group members. In addition, we examined how three key arguments in relation to cultural diversity relate to participants' attitudes. The results show that the endorsement of the mosaic and the assimilation model clearly differs between majority and minority groups, and is related to beliefs about equality, state unity, and group identification.

The findings suggest that the endorsement of the societal models are related to more general factors and processes, such as valuing equality and social cohesion, that work quite similarly among majority and minority groups. In addition, there are important differences between majority and minority group positions in the endorsement of the societal models and the group identification that affects this endorsement. In further research, it would appear necessary to examine these different beliefs and conditions to understand the complexity and diversity of social and political realities. In

doing so, future studies could focus on other groups in other national settings. It is clear that the national context is important and future studies should examine more closely which country differences matter and how exactly they affect the endorsement of the different ways for dealing with diversity. Future studies could also use multiple-item scales for measuring the endorsement of the societal models. Although the present findings are clear and make theoretical sense, single-item measures are not without psychometric problems.

Questions of cultural diversity are hotly debated in many countries and by different groups. Various arguments are presented to defend or challenge ideas, practices, and policies that try to promote cultural diversity. Our results indicate that it is important to examine these arguments in relation to group positions and the key arguments underlying these debates. We hope that future studies will examine these issues further—for example, by using cross-national data, or national data from various regions, institutions and subgroups, related to social class, education, or interethnic friendships. Such studies can further enhance our understanding of adolescents' endorsement of the different societal models. In addition, it seems important to analyze how youth understand the nature and implications of cultural diversity, to examine types of diversity that are relevant in different countries, and to investigate the boundaries or limits of the different societal models.

Note

1. Although our focus was on the comparison between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority group participants, we also examined whether there were mean differences between the three ethnic minority groups. Compared to the Turks and Moroccans, the Surinamese participants had significantly lower group identification and they emphasized the importance of state unity more. The Surinamese were also significantly more in favor of the mosaic model and were less negative about the assimilation model.

References

- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31, 826-874.
- Arends-Tóth, J., & Van De Vijver, F. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 249-266.
- Balibar, E. (1991). Is there a neo-racism? In E. Balibar & I. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Race, nation, class: Ambiguous identities* (pp. 17-18). London: Vergo.
- Barker, M. (1981). *The new racism*. London: Junction Books.

- Barry, B. (2001). *Culture and equality: An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Baubock, R., Heller, A., & Zolberg, A. R. (Eds.). (1996). *The challenge of diversity: Integration and pluralism in societies of immigration*. European Center, Vienna: Avebury.
- Berry, J. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615-631.
- Berry, J., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 27, 301-320.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3-7.
- Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 445-472.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (1996). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 465-480.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369-386.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 135-149.
- Brubaker, R. (2004). *Ethnicity without groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (Eds.). (1999). *Social identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Fredrickson, G. M. (1999). Models of American ethnic relations: A historical perspective. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 23-34). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hagedoorn, L. (1995). Intergroup biases in multiple group systems: The perception of ethnic hierarchies. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 199-228). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy. *British Journal of Sociology*, 55, 237-257.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. (1998). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies, and social status: A matter of ideological asymmetry. *Political Psychology*, 19, 373-404.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. London: McMillan.
- Phinney, J. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9, 34-49.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156-176.
- Phinney, J. S., Ferguson, D. L., & Tate, J. D. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development*, 68, 955-969.
- Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1992). *The disuniting of America*. New York: Norton.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sinclair, S., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (1998). The interface between ethnic and social system attachment: The differential effects of hierarchy-enhancing and hierarchy-attenuating environments. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 741-757.
- Taguieff, P. A. (1993). From race to culture: The New Rights' view of European identity. *Telos, 98/99*, 99-125.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton Press.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2004). *Human development report 2004: Cultural liberty in today's diverse world*. New York: United Nations.
- Van de Vijver, F., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. London: Sage.
- van Oudenhoven, J., Prins, K., & Buunk, B. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 995-1013.
- Verkuyten, M. (2004). Everyday ways of thinking about multiculturalism. *Ethnicities, 4*, 53-74.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005a). Ethnic group identification, and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 121-138.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005b). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. London: Psychology Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 91-108.
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. (2006). The endorsement of minority rights: The role of group position, national context, and ideological beliefs. *Political Psychology, 27*, 527-548.
- Vermeulen, H., & Slijper, B. (2003). *Multiculturalisme in Canada, Australië en de Verenigde Staten* [Multiculturalism in Canada, Australia and the United States]. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Wieviorka, M. (1995). *The arena of racism*. London: Sage.
- Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2002). The relationship between acculturation strategies, relative fit and intergroup relations: Immigrant-majority relations in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32*, 171-188.

Peary Brug is a senior lecturer in the School of Human Sciences at St. Mary's College, in the United Kingdom. His research deals with issues of social identity and social identity development among ethnic minorities. He is a member of the Society of Personality and Social Psychology and is involved with the European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER).

Maykel Verkuyten is a professor in the department of interdisciplinary social science at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. He is also a senior researcher at ERCOMER. His research interest is in ethnic identity and interethnic relations, particularly among young people. His recent publications include the book *The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity*.